(1)

O.S. 1082

(3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 4688 /2004 Single Bench

PETITIONER

P. R. No. 3089/04
Presented by Shri Vinod Chandani
dated 3-9-04

Indo Lahari Bio Power Limited, through : Its Manager, Jarauda, Tah and Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through The Industrial Court, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

2. Sohan Lal Baghel, son of Rikhi Ram Baghel, resident of village Jarauda, PO Tarra, P.S. – Dharsinwa, Tah and Distt. Raipur (CG)

RECEIVED COPY
3/9/04
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

3. Visheshar Khunte, son of Birsingh Khute, resident of village and Post Mangoli, Tah and distt. Raipur (C.G.)

4. Sevaram Verma, son of Shri Manrakhan Lal Verma, resident of village and Post – Khanna, Police Station – Dharsinwa, Tah and Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

शपथ आयुक्त
3/9/04
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT / WRITS, ORDER / ORDERS AND DIRECTION / DIRECTIONS.

The above named Petitioner, most respectfully beg to submit as under:-

(22)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No. 4688 सन् 2004

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश

10.2.2005

Shri Virendra Sharma, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Sudhir Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State on advance copy.

Heard on admission.

The petitioner has filed this petition against the impugned order dated 16.7.2004 which is a common order passed in Misc.Appeal Nos.167/MPIR/III/2003, 168/MPIR/III/2003 and 169/MPIR/III/2003. These Misc. Appeals arise out of the order dated 20.11.2003 passed by the Labour Court, Raipur, in 3 separate cases namely Proceedings No.253/MPIR/2001, 254/MPIR/2001 and 255/MPIR/2001. These appeals were filed before the Industrial Court against the aforesaid order by which the labour Court has directed the employer to produce certain documents on filing application of the employees (respondents No.2 to 4 herein).

It transpires from para 4 of the impugned order that the employess had preferred 3 separate cases under section 31(3) read with section 61 of the M.P(C.G) Industrial Relations Act 1960 and in these proceedings, the aforesaid applications for production of documents were filed by them which were contested by the employer and the orders dated 20.11.2003 (in 3 different cases) were passed by the labour Court. It transpires from the orders that in fact, the

Gr. PRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.

(23)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश

employer (petitioner herein) had admitted that the required documents are in possession of the petitioner, but the same could not be filed because those documents are to be shown in various Courts where the other proceedings are going on. It is in these circumstances, the learned Labour Court passed 3 separate orders on 20.11.2003 (in all 3 cases) and directed to file the copies of documents in place of originals looking to the limited objection of the petitioner. Against these orders, the Miscellaneous Appeals were preferred before the Industrial Court and the Industrial Court dismissed the appeals finding no merits in them.

I have perused the impugned order passed by the Industrial Court and have also perused the orders passed by the Labour Court. The orders are justified. I do not find any reason warranting interference of this Court in the impugned order.

Having considered the facts and circumstances and material on record, I am not inclined to admit the petition filed against the impugned order. The petition is dismissed at the admission stage.

C.C. as per rules.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

Rao

GL PRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.